

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed February 24, 2006. Reconsideration of this application in view of the below remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 1-38 are pending in the application with Claims 5-20, 25-29, 31 and 33-36 having been withdrawn. Of the presently elected claims, Claim 1 is in independent form. By the present amendment, Claim 1 has been amended.

A telephone interview with the Examiner was held on May 12, 2006. After discussing the language of Claim 1 in conjunction with the relevant portions of the specification and FIGs. 3 and 4, the Examiner was persuaded of the novelty of the invention.

However, at issue, according to the Examiner, is the ambiguity of the claim language and the fact that the specification does not provide adequate detail of FIG. 4. The Examiner suggested that Claim 1 be amended to provide a more detailed description of the distinguishing feature shown in FIG. 4, namely the gate signal pulse occurring at a predetermined time delay after a positive edge of the test clock signal.

Additionally, a proposed amendment was submitted by facsimile which addresses the above-identified issues.

Based on the a further telephone interview held on May 24, 2006, Claim 1 has been amended to recite: "...a two-pulse generator for generating two pulses spaced from each other by a pulse interval equal to a period of a test clock for the delay test, said test clock being input from an external source, and supplying the generated two pulses to the scan path test circuit, said two-pulse generator comprises a gate signal generator for generating a gate signal to extract two pulses from said test clock and a latch gate circuit for outputting two pulses from said test clock according to said gate signal, said gate signal generator generating one of a positive and negative

edge of said gate signal at a predetermined time delay after a negative edge of said test clock as measured from an input timing of a control signal.

The limitations recited in amended Claim 1 are supported by FIGs. 3 and 4 and in relevant portions of the specification. Therefore, no new subject matter is introduced into the disclosure by way of the present amendment.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 37 and 38 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 37 and 38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,524,114 issued to Peng.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite: "...said two-pulse generator comprises a gate signal generator for generating a gate signal to extract two pulses from said test clock and a latch gate circuit for outputting two pulses from said test clock according to said gate signal, said gate signal generator generating said gate signal after a predetermined interval after an edge of said test clock signal as measured from an input timing of a control signal."

Since FIG. 3 of Peng clearly shows that the gate signal (SCK-1) 222 is synchronized with the test clock (TCK) 110, such that the rising edge of SCK-1 222 occurs simultaneous with the rising edge of TCK 110, Peng fails to teach outputting two pulses from said test clock according to said gate signal, said gate signal generator generating one of a positive and negative edge of said gate signal at a predetermined time delay after a negative edge of said test clock as measured from an input timing of a control signal.

Further, Peng discloses that clock pulses 312 of SCK-1 222 and 316 of TCK 110 are phase locked in frequency and phase. Therefore, each clock pulse leading edge, when going from a logic low to a logic high, will occur at substantially the same time. (See: FIG. 3 312, 316, and 318; col. 7, lines 45-50). Consequently, Peng does not teach generating the gate signal after a

predetermined interval after an edge of the test clock signal.

Therefore, for at least the reasons given above, Claims 1, 2, 37 and 38 are believed to patentably distinct and allowable over the prior art references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claims 1, 2, 37 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

II. Rejection of Claims 3-4, 21-24, 30 and 32 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 3-4, 21-24, 30 and 32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentably obvious over Peng in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,794,175 issued to Conner. Claims 3-4, 21-24, 30 and 32 depend from independent Claim 1 and thus recite all the limitations of that independent claim.

While Conner discloses a printed circuit board (PCB) memory array board 210 having a plurality of sockets for burn-in quality testing, there is, however, no disclosure or suggestion of a delay test and two-pulse generator, wherein a gate signal generator generates one of a positive and negative edge of said gate signal at a predetermined time delay after a negative edge of said test clock as measured from an input timing of a control signal, as recited in Applicant's independent Claim 1.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 4 and 30, the Examiner asserts that frequency divider 210 of Peng is equivalent to the claimed frequency multiplying PLL circuit by citing that dividing a frequency by N is the equivalent of multiplying that same frequency by $1/N$. However, while this is mathematically correct, the result is not equivalent since multiplying the frequency by $1/N$ will reduce the frequency. What is meant by "to multiply the frequency" as recited in the claim and supported throughout the specification is "to increase the frequency" by a given factor. Additionally, supporting circuitry would be necessary to allow an input of value N to produce a

multiplied frequency output of ($N \times \text{frequency}$) using a frequency divider 210, thus the frequency divider 210 and the frequency multiplying PLL cannot properly be equated.

Conner fails to overcome the above-identified deficiencies of Peng, and thus Peng and Conner, taken alone or in any proper combination, fail to disclose or suggest the limitations recited in Applicant's Claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the reasons given above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claims 3-4, 21-24, 30 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Peng in view of Conner.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 1-4, 21-24, 30, 32 and 37-38 are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Applicant's undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Esatto, Jr.
Registration No. 30,749

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza - Ste. 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

PJE:DAT:jam